

REMARKS

The Examiner objects to the specification because the abstract is not on a separate sheet. The applicant reviewed the specification as filed and believes that the abstract is already on a separate page. If the Examiner disagrees, or wishes to discuss any other formatting changes, please feel free to call the undersigned attorney.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph as indefinite for failing to state the test standard by which each property is measured. Appropriate amendments to the claims have been made.

Claims 1-17, 20-22, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Tau et al. (US 2001/0046606). The Examiner states that Tau teaches a film comprising a core layer of propylene homo-or-co-polymer sandwiched between two skin layers of LLDPE and LDPE. The film has a haze less than about 15% and a 2% secant modulus greater than about 50000 psi. The Examiner states that Tau also discloses the use as liners or bags and other characteristics recited in the claims. The Examiner states that Tau does not explicitly disclose the cross directional shrinkage values or force for the film, but that those properties would be inherent because the film of Tau is compositionally and structurally identical to the claimed film. The Applicants traverse as follows.

The claims, as currently amended, require, among other things, that the skin layers be "devoid of a homogeneously branched polyethylene resin prepared with a single site catalyst." Published Application No. US2001/0046606A1 (D1) provides examples, all of which use Polyethylene Blend A which comprises a polyethylene made with a CGC catalyst, which is a single site catalyst. See paragraph [0104]. As such, the actual products disclosed in this reference do not have the identical structure, indeed do not meet all of the limitations, of the current claims. Therefore, Tau does not anticipate current independent claims 1 and 16.

Claims 1-17, 20-22, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Fukada et al. (US 2002/0127421). The Examiner states that Fukada teaches a film comprising a

core made from a blend of LLDPE and LDPE sandwiched between two skin layers of LLDPE. The film has a haze less than about 15% and a 1% secant modulus greater than about 27500 psi. The Examiner states that Fukada also discloses the use as liners or bags and other characteristics recited in the claims. The Examiner states that Fukada does not explicitly disclose the cross directional shrinkage values or force for the film, but that those properties would be inherent because the film of Fukada is compositionally and structurally identical to the claimed film. The Applicants traverse as follows.

The claims, as currently amended, require, among other things, that the skin layers be “devoid of a homogeneously branched polyethylene resin prepared with a single site catalyst.” Published Application No. US2002/0127421A1 (D2) provides two examples, both of which comprise metallocene catalyzed polyethylene in the surface layers. See paragraphs [0099] and [0108]. Metallocene catalysts are single site catalysts. As such, the actual products disclosed in this reference do not have the identical structure, indeed do not meet all of the limitations, of the current claims. Therefore, Fukada does not anticipate the currently amended claims.

Claims 1, 8-17, 20-22, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Nelson (EP 0388177A). The Examiner states that Nelson discloses a film comprising a core layer made from EVA, VLDPE or ethylene butyl acrylate copolymer sandwiched between two skin layers made of LLDPE. The film has a cross-directional shrink of at least about 20% and is used in the packaging field. The Applicants traverse as follows.

The claims, as currently amended, require, among other things, that the skin layers be “devoid of a homogeneously branched polyethylene resin prepared with a single site catalyst.” This amendment incorporated all of the limitations of claim 2 into the independent claims. Given that the Examiner did not reject claim 2 over Nelson, all of the currently pending claims must therefore also be patentable over Nelson.

Claims 1-17, 20-22, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by WO 0110642 (Banaszak). The Examiner states that Banaszak teaches a film having an ethylene/ α -olefin copolymer core and skin layers possibly made from EVA or polypropylene. The film has a haze less than 5% and a cross directional shrink of at least 8%.


The Applicants traverse on the grounds that Banaszak teaches a different principle of operation. Banaszak repeatedly emphasizes the necessity of multicomponent ethylene/ α -olefin copolymer interpenetrating network (IPN) for the films of their inventions. Such IPNs are not necessary for the purposes of the current invention.

Based on the amendments and arguments contained in this response, the applicants believe that all pending claims are now allowable. As such, the applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the current rejections and issue a notice of allowance.

Extension of Term.

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.136 apply. Applicant believes that a 3-month extension of term is required and a petition for extension of time is hereby made. Please charge Account No. 041512.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan E. Wagner
Reg. No. 45,188

July 10, 2008

ADDRESS:
WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C.
555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900
Milwaukee, WI 53202
414-273-2100
Customer No. 29423